

## REMARKS

### Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 2, 4, 7, and 8 recite allowable subject matter. New claim 22 corresponds to the prior version of claim 2, written in independent form, and thus is clearly now in condition for allowance.

### Rejection under 35 USC §102(b) in view of Goto et al. (US 5,979,182)

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 9-11, 15, 16 and 19-21 are rejected as allegedly being anticipated in view of the Goto et al. (US 5,979,182). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

In the rejection, reference is made to Figure 6 of Goto et al. (US '182). It is asserted that Figure 6 shows three separate flow areas for fluids which do **not** extend across the entire width of the heat exchanger. However, this is incorrect.

Figure 6 illustrates a main heat exchanger having four flow areas for providing heat exchange between four fluids. The four fluids flow through four different heat exchange units, A<sub>1</sub>-A<sub>4</sub>. See Figures 8A-8D. Thus, in heat exchange unit A<sub>1</sub> a fluid, such as nitrogen gas, flows from distributor D<sub>1</sub> upwards through unit A<sub>1</sub>, and is removed from the main heat exchanger by way of collector D<sub>a</sub>. As can be seen from Figure 8A, heat exchange unit A<sub>1</sub> extends across the entire width of the heat exchanger. The same is true for units A<sub>2</sub>-A<sub>4</sub> illustrated in Figures 8B-8D. See also the discussion of Figures 6-8 at column 3, lines 10-36. See also the discussion regarding distribution in the width direction at column 8, lines 42-27.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that US '182 fails to anticipate applicants' claimed invention as recited in claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 9-11, 15, 16 and 19-21. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC §102(b) is respectfully requested.

### Rejection under 35 USC §103(a) in view of Goto et al. (US'182)


Claims 12-14, 17 and 18 are rejected as allegedly being obvious in view of Goto et al. (US 5,979,182). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

In the rejection it is alleged that Goto et al. the "basic inventive concept" which includes

multiple flow areas that do not extend across the entire width of the heat exchanger. As discussed above, this is incorrect. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Goto et al. fails to render obvious applicants' claimed invention. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,



Brion P. Heaney, Reg. No. 32,542  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO  
& BRANIGAN, P.C.  
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400  
2200 Clarendon Boulevard  
Arlington, Virginia 22201  
Telephone: (703) 243-6333  
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: LINDE-597 P1

Date: August 23, 2006